

January 6

outcome of enormous blunders committed during the Second World War. A plan for dividing authority over the world between two great blocks of countries was drawn up during the Teheran conference: America was the strongest power in one of these and Russia in the other. The plan acquired concrete forms at Yalta and Potsdam, with absolute disregard shown for the rights of feeble nations to sovereign state existence. America concluded the arrangement in the conviction that to hand over a number of European countries with an aggregate population of over 100 million souls to Russia would satiate the imperialism of that country. America undoubtedly believed at the time that her primacy in the Western bloc would for the most part apply to her wartime allies, prepared to share this authority voluntarily. But Russia, with her usual imperialistic ambitions, desired to exploit the situation for the purpose of further expansion.

In time, that happened which had to happen. Russia's real policy was soon revealed. The transformation of the Russian zone of occupation in Germany into a separate Communist republic and the evident aim of incorporating Berlin within it opened the eyes of the Western Powers. The cold war ensued, and lasts to this day. Its essential nature stems in reality from the fact that Russia is still trying to extend her influence wherever possible: in Asia, Africa, and in South America. The United States, conscious that present-day nuclear armaments make warfare overdangerous, is exerting every effort to prevent the cold war becoming a real one. Under such conditions, the upper hand in diplomatic negotiations is usually gained by the more insolent side. And, in this respect, Russia is unequalled.

It is only when we also take into consideration the ever greater clash of views within the two blocs that we acquire a better idea of the soaring difficulties implicit in the world situation.

Within the Communist bloc, Sino-Russian disputes are more and more evident. For, China rejects the primacy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and, in addition, has advanced extensive claims to territories held by Russia. Other Communist countries, such as Rumania and Yugoslavia, are profiting by this conflict in an attempt to emancipate themselves from Russian tutelage as far as possible.

Unfortunately, a similar situation has arisen in the West. The continental countries of Europe realize their weakness in relation to Russia; they are unable to defend themselves against Russia without American help as matters now stand. This brings about a specific feeling of uncertainty which need evoke no surprise. They all know, though nothing is said on this point for several reasons, that among 100 million Europeans handed over to Russia in order to gain her good will, there were not only neutral nations but also those most loyal allies of the Western Powers, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Each of the Western European Powers is troubled by the insistent thought that such a transaction may be repeated. In these conditions, the free part of Europe cannot but aim at assuring itself against such an eventuality. This gives rise to two natural aspirations. Europe must unite if her voice is to carry weight in world affairs. Furthermore, possession of own nuclear armament, dependent on nobody else, is essential for defense against possible Russian attacks. After all, when Great Britain and France tried without American permission to settle the Suez Canal dispute by force, the U.S. 6th Fleet demonstrated off Suez with the implied threat of recourse to arms.

At present, France has taken the lead in efforts to achieve both these aims. We know neither will be attained within the near future, but it is gratifying that a great, though not a decisive step toward European

unity was recently made when agreement was reached on agrarian policy, that most difficult of economic issues.

The cause of a United Europe has great significance for Poland. Poland's national culture is fully part of West European civilization, and liberation from Russian imposed hegemony will never cease to be one of our goals. Thus, I am convinced that the Polish nation will be prepared to join United Europe on an equal footing with the other European nations.

But we must also consider the fact that the Polish nation cannot erase from memory the terrible barbarity of Germany's behavior toward Poland during the last war. Nevertheless, the immutable fact that we are neighbors of Germany remains. It can be supposed that Germany as an integral part of a United Europe will be less dangerous for us than if she were to conduct a foreign policy of her own unagreed with the other members of such a United Europe—with France, Italy, and the Benelux lands and perhaps ultimately also some other countries. The most purposeful means of allaying the fears of Polish public opinion in this connection would be for Germany to recognize the Oder-Neisse frontier as soon as possible.

In any case, Poland's accession to a united Europe would be an incomparably better settlement of the Polish issue than that proposed by the stooge regime imposed upon her by Russia. This regime's plan proposes the neutralization of present-day West Germany, a step which would in effect perpetuate Poland's status as a satellite of Russia's.

A neutral zone between Communist Russia and western Europe would be purposeful only if no United Europe arose or if such a Europe proved too weak to extend its organization beyond the Iron Curtain. In such case, this zone would have to consist of all the European countries which lost their independence after the last war. Such a solution has been proposed by the Polish Government (in exile) on more than one occasion.

If a United Europe arises, the hope can be entertained that the first steps would be taken within it to bring about that state of affairs which the Pope called for in his Christmas message and that universal peace and the brotherhood of all people may in due course prevail in such a United Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must reestablish a foreign policy based on victory rather than slow defeat in the cold war. The stirring words of legitimate voices of the captive peoples such as this message of the President of the Polish Government in exile serve as an inspiration to us to continue the long, hard, but necessarily successful struggle against the false ideology of communism.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### AN AMERICAN RESPONSE TO SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion in previous years to speak on the odious and discriminatory treat-

ment of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union.

I do so again today, in the opening stage of a new Congress, because I fervently believe that religious persecution is an outrage to humanity, and that its continued perpetration, particularly directed at Jews in the Soviet Union, constitutes a crushing obstacle to the world of peace, order, and justice we seek.

Although there are obvious limitations to what Americans can effectively do to alleviate the plight of the Jewish minority in Russia, the House must express itself firmly in this regard so that there may be no political or moral ambiguity. I have introduced two pertinent resolutions on the subject and I hope that my colleagues will join in registering support.

One of them condemns the Soviet Union for its antireligious war, and specifically calls upon their Government to cease its anti-Jewish persecution. The other expresses House support for the efforts to secure, in treaty form through the United Nations, a universal condemnation and prohibition of anti-Semitism. The objective here is to establish anti-Semitism as an international offense.

There are many people in the world today who will immediately cling to the illusory argument that national sovereignty prohibits any such action. They will contend that each and every country is an isolated, self-propelling region of the earth completely independent from external considerations. They will say, in effect: You have no right to interfere.

I must insist that there are interests which transcend national boundaries and render them meaningless. If we are to draw any conclusive lessons from the tough struggles of this century, it is that we are an interdependent world, and that isolation and narrow self-interest lead to war and suffering.

In my view, the military realities of current existence may prevent modern war for a good while to come. But these will not justify our policy in history. They are artificial and shifting. In the final analysis, a livable peace can only be attained by concentrating both strength and perception upon a continuing search for world law.

In the 20th century world law has also come to mean human rights. World War II ushered in a new arena, uplifting the individual in some respects, making him susceptible to the precepts of accepted norms of conduct.

What this country does to enhance the rights of the individual can live in history.

The eradication of all forms of racial and religious discrimination belongs in this category. The catastrophic and tragic policies of national socialism are remembered. Since then the means have become less crude. But it is the means themselves, and the character that breeds such offense, which must be reprimanded and effectively policed.

I will not repeat here the many aspects of Soviet anti-Semitism. It involves a premeditated effort to stamp out Jewish culture and religion.

1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

135

four more judicial districts for the State and four additional judgeships.

This legislation, in somewhat different form, has been proposed on a number of past occasions, and the need now is more acute than ever. I am most hopeful that this year will bring success to what is basically and by its nature bipartisan legislation and which I understand now has the unanimous support of the California delegation.

Our State has had the good fortune to prove increasingly attractive to the citizens of this country, with the result that our population increase has been phenomenal. It follows that the need for Federal judicial services likewise has increased. I would particularly call attention to the situation in the southern part of the State, an area with whose needs I am particularly familiar. San Diego alone has seen an increase of population of more than 134,000 persons since the 1960 census. Moreover the area encompasses the 25th Custom Collection District which is the largest narcotic and border egress and ingress district in the United States. In addition, there are the International Port of San Diego and the military and defense establishments which generate increasing litigation.

For these reasons, my bill would set up a southern district in the State, comprised of San Diego and Imperial Counties, and provide for a U.S. court to be held in San Diego.

The additional southern judicial district would eliminate the expense, delays, inconvenience, and administrative red-tape now occasioned by the fact that the district offices are in Los Angeles, more than 100 miles away. The San Diego County Bar Association has estimated that the savings to the Federal Government alone would more than compensate for the estimated \$46,750 annual cost of implementing this legislation.

Turning to the predicament of the State as a whole, I would point out that California, the second State in population, now has only two judicial districts, one less than in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Illinois, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania.

In plain fact, California has outgrown her present judicial garments. Justice is delayed, respect for law is not enhanced, the business of the Federal Government is slowed and made more costly, and the maintenance of the orderly processes of law is rendered more difficult by this embarrassment.

The remedy is at hand. It is simple. It is effective. And it involves no notable cost, but rather a saving. Finally, it is badly needed.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1801

A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 84 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 84. California

“California is divided into four judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

“NORTHERN DISTRICT

“(a) The Northern District comprises three divisions.

“(1) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Sonoma.

“Court for the Northern Division shall be held at San Francisco and Eureka.

“(2) The Eastern Division comprises the counties of Alameda, and Contra Costa.

“Court for the Eastern Division shall be held at Oakland.

“(3) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz.

“Court for the Southern Division shall be held at San Jose.

“EASTERN DISTRICT

“(b) The Eastern District comprises three divisions.

“(1) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity.

“Court for the Northern Division shall be held at Redding.

“(2) The Central Division comprises the counties of Alpine, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Inyo, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sierra, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tuolumne, all of Yosemite National Park, Yolo, and Yuba.

“Court for the Central Division shall be held at Sacramento.

“(3) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera except Yosemite National Park, Mariposa except Yosemite National Park, Merced, and Tulare.

“Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Fresno.

“CENTRAL DISTRICT

“(c) The Central District comprises the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

“Court for the Central District shall be held at Los Angeles.

“SOUTHERN DISTRICT

“(d) The Southern District comprises the counties of Imperial and San Diego.

“Court for the Southern District shall be held at San Diego.”

Sec. 2. (a) The two district judges for the Northern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section and whose official station is Sacramento shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Eastern District of California whose official station shall be Sacramento. All other district judges for the Northern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Northern District of California.

(b) The district judge for the Southern District of California, residing in the Northern Division thereof and holding office on the day before the effective date of this section, shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judge for the Eastern District of California whose official station shall be Fresno. The two district judges for the Southern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section and whose official station is San Diego shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Southern District of California, as established by subsection (d) of the first section of this Act. All

other district judges for the Southern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Central District of California.

Sec. 3. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the Northern District of California, and two additional district judges for the Central District of California.

Sec. 4. Not less than one judge of the Northern District of California shall have his station at San Jose, and not less than one judge in that district shall have his station at Oakland.

Sec. 5. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28, United States Code, will reflect the changes made by this Act in the number of judicial districts and district judgeships for the State of California, such table is amended to read as follows:

Districts	Judges
California:	
Northern.....	9
Eastern.....	3
Central.....	12
Southern.....	2

Sec. 6. The first section and section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act. The other provisions of this Act shall take effect on such date of enactment.

### REPORT TO THE POLISH

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to commence each new year the President of the Polish Government in Exile, the truly legitimate government of the Polish people, reports to the Polish nation.

In view of the tremendous interest which Americans and all freedom-loving people have in the just aspirations of the people of Poland and the other captives of communism to reestablish free, democratic governments in their lands, I am placing in the RECORD at this point the 1965 New Year's speech by the President of the Polish Government in Exile, August Zaleski:

NEW YEAR'S SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND, LONDON, JANUARY 3, 1965

His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, addressed members of the Polish Government in Exile, the Council of the Republic of Poland, and representatives of Polish organizations and of the Polish Community in Great Britain on January 3, 1965, as follows:

“Looking back at the past 12 months, as we do every year, we cannot but be struck by the changes which occurred in the governments of many countries with a democratic or a Communist system in force. However, some of these changes are so relatively recent that it cannot be determined which transformations, if any, they will produce on the international forum. There are many matters which may lead to serious complications.

For, these complications exist not only in East-West relations but also within both the rival blocs. It must be plainly stated that this complex situation is undoubtedly an

1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

137

There is a consistent effort to keep Jews in the Soviet Union out of observable government positions. Anti-Jewish publications, of the most crass nature, are officially favored. Restrictive measures have been taken against synagogues and Jewish schools. The release of Yiddish books is practically prohibited. All cultural activity, such as the theater productions, has been halted. Many Jews are refused entrance to institutions of higher learning. And with the implementation of the law relative to so-called economic crimes, approximately 55 percent of those sentenced to death since 1961 have been Jews, which account for 1.9 percent of the entire Russian population.

In connection with the latter item, the International Commission of Jurists, in a staff study presented in the summer 1964 Journal, brought forth some authoritative commentary. In the court proceedings on economic crimes, the Commission wrote that "a disproportionate emphasis is placed on the nefarious activities of Jewish defendants"—Journal of the International Commission of Jurists, summer, 1964, volume V, No. 1: "Economic Crimes in the Soviet Union," staff study, Geneva, Switzerland.

In the so-called Frunze affair, the study notes that "the prominence given to the Jewish defendants clearly indicates an attempt to lay the main guilt at their door."

Although the report concludes that there is no "organized discrimination," it does say:

The number of Jews receiving death sentences and severe terms of imprisonment is greatly disproportionate to their number as a minority group.

In the autumn of 1963, the Soviet Government undertook a multifaceted campaign against all religions. For those interested I would recommend the recent article of Mr. Harry Willetts in the November-December edition of Problems of Communism.

Quite naturally, anti-Judaism forms a part of this campaign. But it is at once inseparable and apart from the campaign.

Religion, as such, is not only inimical to dialectical materialism, but in practical terms repugnant to the all-inclusive nature of the dictatorial state. Religion will interject a second loyalty which is instinctively abhorrent to the Communist regime. Communism requires that we render all and everything unto Caesar.

But the attack upon Judaism and Jewish life has different implications. It is a heritage which has Western connections. It is a more independently identifiable community. As such, the Jewish citizens have always been considered a political threat, more important and menacing than other minority groups. Many Russian Jews, moreover, have personal relatives living in the West.

For these reasons the Soviet policy of discrimination against Jews, as distinct from other groups, has been more deliberate and harsh. The insipid anti-Semitic sentiments among much of the Russian population are famed. It is a deliberate policy, but also a secretive

one; the techniques are shrewd and sophisticated, and the object is always, if possible, to avoid an outright show of official attitudes which can unfavorably affect world opinion.

Last year a constructive move was made in the other body to amend the Foreign Assistance Act. The amendment condemned the Soviet policy of anti-Semitism. Unfortunately, and in spite of the energy of the junior Senator from Connecticut, the amendment was deleted prior to final congressional passage.

Right now it is important that we again strive for some positive steps. As I mentioned earlier, there are realities with which we must deal. We cannot officially, in any real sense, compel a foreign government to make certain domestic adjustments. But we can express our honest feelings; we should expect our own Government to undertake diplomatic representations with the Soviet Union in keeping with our belief in human dignity; we can energetically work for the attainment of an international treaty, including an effective clause on anti-Semitism; we can, by expressing ourselves forthrightly, muster a world opinion to which, as we are aware, communism listens.

Recently, I corresponded with the Department of State seeking a clarification of official American opinion. Specifically I asked whether fresh diplomatic initiatives could not be taken to seek an alleviation of the discrimination against Jews in Russia. Although I believe the Department has a sincere interest and concern in this area, I cannot agree with the officials that diplomatic action is undesirable. It is their feeling that representation of this nature would be contrary to the welfare of Russian Jewry; I disagree. For the Record, I include the Department's letter to me, dated November 6, 1964, following the conclusion of my remarks.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the House will join in pressing for the enactment of my two resolutions. They are not radical. They do not aim to drastically tie the hands of the executive branch in foreign policy. They simply express American condemnation of the Soviet anti-Semitic trends, and they set this House on record in full support of a world convention, effectively enforced, prohibiting religious and racial discrimination.

I do not believe that mere speech-making on the part of Government personnel can possibly be an effective instrument in this case. It has proved its ineffectuality already.

This effort toward a reversal of Russian anti-Semitism forms part of American world objectives. I see no reason why we should be timid. I seek action, concrete and clear, and I believe we should make a contribution toward the elimination of prejudice and persecution wherever it exists.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1964.  
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: On behalf of the Secretary I wish to thank you for the

letter which you addressed to him on October 28, 1964, suggesting that the Department review the record relating to Soviet Jewry with a view to considering what representations might be made to the Soviet authorities to bring about a reversal in their anti-Semitic practices.

Restrictions on the religious and cultural life of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union are a matter of deep and continuing concern to the Department and to high officials of our Government. Acting upon the instructions of the Secretary after his meeting on April 7, 1964, with representatives of a Washington Conference on Soviet Jewry, the Department reviewed the available information about the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union. The enclosed statement prepared during the course of this review and now brought up to date gives the Department's assessment of the situation of Soviet Jews.

Although as expressed in the statement it is the belief of the Department that formal official protests would not be in the best interests of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, responsible officials in our Government continue to search for practical means of helping the Soviet Jews, as well as other religious groups which suffer similar persecution in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A reference to the record of the past year gives evidence of these efforts:

On October 27, 1963, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman denounced Soviet anti-Semitism in a speech before the American Jewish Congress in New York City.

On December 6, 1963, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard N. Gardner also denounced Soviet anti-Semitism before the same audience and urged a strengthening of U.N. human rights procedures to focus international attention on problems of this kind.

On February 28, 1964, Mrs. Marietta Tree, U.S. representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, introduced a specific amendment on anti-Semitism to the Draft Convention on Racial Discrimination then under debate and drew attention to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

On April 7, 1964, the Department of State issued the following statement after a meeting between the Secretary of State and representatives of a Washington Conference on Soviet Jewry:

"At the meeting this morning, Secretary Rusk took the occasion to reaffirm the concern expressed by Mrs. Marietta Tree, U.S. representative on the United Nations Human Rights Commission, that anti-Semitism is used by some members of the United Nations to turn groups against each other and to deprive Jewish minorities of the religious and cultural heritage which makes this group unique. He confirmed the proposal made by Mrs. Tree that U.N. members pledge themselves to eradicate anti-Semitism in accordance with their obligations under the United Nations Charter."

On April 30, 1964, Secretary of State Rusk in a speech before the American Jewish Committee stated:

"I would add my assurance that American leaders at the highest levels are aware of the problems of Soviet Jewry and that Soviet leaders are aware of our concern. We shall continue to make known our interest in the welfare of religious communities within the Soviet Union and elsewhere, because we consider human rights indivisible."

On October 28, 1964, the President sent a telegram to the New York Conference on Soviet Jewry in which he called attention to the position of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union and stated that all responsible officials of the U.S. Government continue to search for practical methods of alleviating the position of Soviet Jews. He expressed the belief that the official actions available to the United States must be rein-

forced by the pressure of an aroused world public opinion; and the hope that citizens and organizations of all faiths will join in an overwhelming expression of moral concern for the Jews of the Soviet Union, believing that the moral judgment of millions of people throughout the world cannot be ignored by any government.

I wish to assure you that the Department considers the situation of Soviet Jewry to be a subject of active concern meriting a continued high priority of attention. Consequently, the Department will be alert to consider every appropriate initiative which might bring relief to this and other oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if the Department can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. LEE,  
Acting Assistant Secretary  
for Congressional Relations.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. CONTE, for 15 minutes, tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOWARD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUNKEL and to include a speech by the president of the National Federation of Federal Employees.

Mr. RYAN to revise and extend his remarks during colloquy with Mr. FARBERSTEIN.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNGATE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MINX) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. BRADEMANS in eight instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. HALL in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. MCCLORY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STRATTON.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

269. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the financial statements of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

270. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting a report on the operations of the Postal Savings System for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

271. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to prescribe the basic pay and allowances of an officer who is serving as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Weather Bureau or the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research, Department of Commerce"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

273. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting required report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the grade of major pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 301 (g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

274. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

275. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unsupported costs included in price of nuclear submarine valves purchased from Crane Co., Chicago, Ill., by Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa., under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

276. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on administration of functions of the General Services Administration for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

277. A letter from the Acting General Counsel Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

278. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

279. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

280. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

281. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

282. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

284. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the allocation or placement of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503(a) of Public Law 84-854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

285. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled, 'An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws,' to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 5, 1965]

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1495. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and